

Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above referenced case on June 19, 2006. Claims 1-40 are standing for examination. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-22, 24-32, and 34-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Sehr (U.S. 6,386,451) hereinafter Sehr. Claims 3, 13, 23 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sehr in view of Freishtat et al. (U.S. 6,317,783) hereinafter Freishtat.

Applicant has carefully studied the prior art references provided by the Examiner, and the Examiner's rejections and statements. In response, applicant herein provides arguments which serve to overcome the 112 rejection and the 102(e) rejection relying upon the teachings of Sehr. There are no amendments made to the claims in this response.

Regarding the 112 rejection, the Examiner states; "Claim 1 states a "rules-based filter" but there is filtering steps in the claim. (Applicant assumes the Examiner meant to say 'no' filtering steps.) Instead it appears to only be "interacting" with communications and therefore it appears that no filtering is actually performed and there is no indication of any criteria used in a filtering process. Therefore, claims 1 is rendered indefinite because the manner in which the "rules-based filter" works would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Claims 11, 21 and 31 have similar limitations to that of claim 1 and therefore are rejected in a similar manner."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's above interpretation of applicant's independent claims. The independent claims specifically recite; "a discrimination layer for providing specific services to said customers according to one or more characteristics of the Web site of the second enterprise". Applicant argues that a

discrimination layer serves to restrict services according to a second Web site, therefore, removing some services and allowing others meets the definition of a filter.

Regarding the 102 rejection, the Examiner states; "Regarding claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 Sehr discloses a software-based syndication and filtering platform for a first Web server hosted by a first enterprise, comprising: a rules-based filter for interacting with communications from customers of the first enterprise, the communications coming from a second Web-site of a second enterprise (column 4, line 57 thru column 5, line 6 and column 5, line 58 thru column 6, line 18); and a discrimination layer for providing specific services to said customers according to one or more characteristics of the Web site of the second enterprise (column 7, lines 28-67)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's extremely limited and broad interpretation of Sehr as presented above. Sehr teaches issuing travel cards to users to be physically presented to service providers. In some cases the card information, along with the user ID is presented to a service provider Web site to access services for the customer from a computer or computer based station.

Applicant argues that the services are specifically provided based on the card information and the user identification, *not* based on the Web site originating the request, as claimed. In applicant's invention intermediary Web sites subscribe to PI provider Web sites to access information for clients/users. The services are provided based on the Web site's characteristics accessing the information, not only the ID/subscription information of the user. None of the portions of Sehr provided by the Examiner to support the rejection specifically teaches providing specific services to said customers according to one or more characteristics of the Web site of the second enterprise. All services in Sehr are limited to the card information and the ID of the card holder. The card holder may use a "station" to access travel services in Sehr, but the services are not discriminated based on characteristics of the accessing Web site, as claimed.

For the above reasons, applicant believes that the claims, as amended and argued above, are clearly and unarguably patentable over the combined art presented by the Examiner. As all of the claims have been shown to be patentable over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this response, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Gregg Freishtat et al.

By *Donald R. Boys*
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.
3 Hangar Way, Suite D
Watsonville, CA 95076